

Exhibit E

H9fWalpC

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----x

3 UNITED STATES SECURITIES AND
4 EXCHANGE COMMISSION,

Plaintiff,

v.

17 Civ. 4179 (DLC)

7 ALPINE SECURITIES CORPORATION,

Conference

Defendant.

9 -----x

10 New York, N.Y.
11 September 15, 2017
2:30 p.m.

12 Before:

13 HON. DENISE L. COTE,

14 District Judge

15 APPEARANCES

16 ZACHARY T. CARLYLE

17 TERRY R. MILLER

Attorneys for Plaintiff

18 U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission

19 CLYDE SNOW & SESSIONS, P.C.

Attorneys for Defendant

20 BY: BRENT R. BAKER

21 AARON D. LEBENTA

22 JONATHAN D. BLETZACKER

H9fWalpC

1 (Case called)

2 MR. CARLYLE: Zachary Carlyle, and with me today is
3 Terry Miller.

4 MR. BAKER: Brent Baker, Aaron Lebenta and Jon
5 Bletzacker, for Alpine Securities.

6 THE COURT: And in addition, your client is with you
7 at the table?

8 MR. BAKER: Yes. We have Chris Frankel, who is
9 representing the client here today.

10 THE COURT: Thank you.

11 This is a case in which the SEC has brought a
12 securities action in New York, and there is a motion that was
13 brought raising a number of issues: lack of personal
14 jurisdiction as a matter of New York's long-arm statute and the
15 due process clause; a venue argument and motion for transfer
16 pursuant to Section 1404, and related issues. At least one of
17 those issues has fallen by the wayside in course of briefing,
18 and I'm prepared to rule on that motion today but want to give
19 the parties an opportunity to add anything that they feel is
20 necessary to their papers.

21 This is the defendant's motion. Mr. Baker, is there
22 anything else you wanted to say?

23 MR. BAKER: With respect to the personal jurisdiction
24 issue?

25 THE COURT: Anything on the motion.

H9fWalpC

MR. BAKER: Yes.

THE COURT: Anything on the motion.

MR. BAKER: I'd like to add a few things. I'll be brief.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. BAKER: OK. As your Honor correctly stated, we brought this motion based on three separate issues and we fully, on the case law, understand that we're going forward on our strongest two arguments, the venue and the transfer motion, and we are happy to answer any questions you have but would rely on the briefing for the personal jurisdiction motion.

THE COURT: I think you've abandoned New York long-arm statute as a ground, but you continue to argue due process. Am I right?

MR. BAKER: Correct.

THE COURT: Fine.

MR. BAKER: OK.

Again, we appreciate the chance, understanding this was originally set as a scheduling conference, and we're grateful to be able to at least argue the substance in part, and we can speak to the Rule 26(f) components.

THE COURT: We'll do that separately after I rule on the motion.

MR. BAKER: Great. OK.

Our goal, of course, is to get your Honor to transfer

H9fWalpC

1 this matter to the most convenient forum, which is not the
2 Southern District of New York. We want to transfer to the
3 District of Utah where a hundred percent of the witnesses, a
4 hundred percent of the parties, and frankly, even it's more
5 convenient for the plaintiffs, who are out of the Denver
6 office. There are 15 flights a day, and it's an hour flight,
7 but there are no parties, more importantly, at all relative to
8 the operative facts, the underlying facts, in this district.

9 The complaint alleges not a trading violation, not
10 fraud, but books-and-records violations. 17(a) and Rule 17a-8,
11 under the Exchange Act, are the record keeping and retention
12 requirements, and they spend considerable time in their
13 opposition to laying out the process of clearing a trade
14 through DTC and NSCC, but that is completely separate from the
15 operative facts of this case. Again, it's a books-and-records
16 case. It's based on a violation that could be succinctly said
17 that their Bank Secrecy Act compliance program was inadequate
18 and that caused suspicious activity reports, SARs, to be filed
19 improperly, incorrectly. I'm sure there are others.

20 There are several categories that they allude to in
21 the complaint, but if I take maybe two minutes here to unpack
22 the filing of a SAR, there are many places in the business of a
23 broker-dealer where a SAR could be filed that have nothing to
24 do with the actual trading in the security. So if a client,
25 new client comes to you and says, I want to open an account,

H9fWalpC

1 and you, based on whatever your metrics are, your red flags
2 are, say, Sorry, we're not opening that account, go on your
3 way, you are required to file a suspicious activity report,
4 that report will never make its way to the DTC or NSCC in New
5 York.

6 Second point in the chain of a securities transaction
7 is when an existing client comes in to deposit a block of
8 stock, sophisticated block of a million shares of XYZ Corp.
9 Well, there's a deposit review team at the broker-dealer that
10 looks at that, and if they detect that there's something
11 suspicious about it, they say, Sorry, we reject this deposit,
12 and again, they hand them back their stock certificate and they
13 file a SAR. Both of those circumstances are pre initiation of
14 a securities trade, but in no circumstance, even though there
15 are two types that I just mentioned, that clearly are pre
16 initiation of a trade, there are no circumstances when DTC will
17 ever intersect with the SAR filings. The time horizons are
18 different.

19 As of, I think, this week, you have three days to
20 clear and settle a trade through DTC and NSCC. You have 30
21 days from the day of the detected suspicious activity to file
22 your SAR with FinCEN, wherever that may be in Washington, D.C.,
23 so they're two time horizons. They are two totally separate
24 events.

25 Let me turn to just the convenience side here, because

H9fWalpC

1 I know your Honor's time is limited.

2 THE COURT: Before you turn to that, I understood,
3 though, that while as a theoretical matter, not every SAR
4 filing is related to a transaction in securities that would
5 clear through New York, and you've given two examples of that
6 kind of situation, but in this case, the SAR violations at
7 issue, as alleged, relate to transactions that resulted in
8 clearing through New York. Am I right?

9 MR. BAKER: It's impossible for me to tell. They have
10 alleged, I think the best you can say is by category, types of
11 SAR filings. I can't tell. They haven't identified specific
12 SARs or specific transactions. That's what discovery, I
13 assume, will be for. But even so, there isn't a situation
14 where DTC will ever intersect with a SAR.

15 A SAR could be filed, and that transaction may make
16 its way on to DTC or NSCC, but it's unrelated to the filing of
17 a SAR or the maintenance of proper books and records within the
18 four walls of Alpine Securities. That's the case they brought.
19 They investigated this matter for two years. I assume they
20 brought their best factual case, and that is, Alpine
21 Securities, as an entity, your books and records were not
22 accurate at a given point in time. That's all I know from
23 their complaint.

24 Certainly, under 1404(a), to transfer this to a more
25 convenient district is where most courts turn first, and

H9fWalpC

1 there's case law that supports that. We've cited that in our
2 brief, but again, there are no parties in this district. There
3 are no transactions. There are no operative facts. The
4 witnesses, again, to use the language that the commission, or
5 the SEC, used, are scattered across the country, but that's not
6 entirely accurate because most of the witnesses identified are
7 either current or former Alpine employees, and they are all
8 located in the general Salt Lake City, Utah, area.

9 There are a couple who are outside of Salt Lake City,
10 Utah, but none of them are in this district.

11 THE COURT: They're in Iowa and Maine.

12 MR. BAKER: Iowa and Maine. That's not the Southern
13 District of New York, and I'm certain that they would agree
14 that it's just as inconvenient for them to come here as it is
15 for them to go to Salt Lake City. In fact, the one in Maine is
16 a current employee and maintains a condominium in Salt Lake
17 City for the two weeks a month he spends there. So as far as
18 convenience goes, there's no question that it's substantially
19 more convenient for parties, witnesses.

20 The lone witness that they claim, that the commission
21 claims, or the SEC claims, is in this district or actually not
22 even in this district -- they just say in the New York area,
23 which I suppose could be anywhere from Philadelphia to
24 Connecticut, but are these two homeland security agents, who
25 sat through some of the proffer interviews and took notes of

H9fWalpC

1 some of the witnesses.

2 Now, mind you, those same homeland security agents and
3 same SEC staffers all went to Salt Lake a couple of times too,
4 but they have no independent knowledge of any of the facts, and
5 there's no guarantee they'll even be called as witnesses. They
6 will be used as impeachment witnesses, in any event, certainly
7 once discovery starts.

8 It's imperative that you understand that this is not a
9 trading case. This is not a manipulation case. This is a
10 books-and-records case, and that whether or not a SAR is filed
11 will never trigger anything as part of the clearance and
12 settlement system, and certainly institutionally, the
13 commission understands that because they issued guidance last
14 week on shortening the clearance and settlement from D plus
15 three to D plus two, so they have three days to clear and
16 settle a trade. You have 30 days to file a SAR, or a
17 suspicious activity report, but it is unquestionable that the
18 center of gravity, and I use that language because it comes
19 from many cases, the center of gravity in this litigation is in
20 Utah. There are very educated, capable federal district court
21 judges there. I do have to concede that in this district,
22 you're more likely to know the securities laws, but these are
23 very smart judges. These are capable judges.

24 I won't bother to track through the factors that
25 relate to convenience, but every single one of them applies in

H9fWalpC

1 Alpine certainly. There really are no connections to this
2 district, and certainly the homeland security agents can't be a
3 connection because they are witnesses well after the operative
4 facts, and they may not even be witnesses unless somebody
5 changes their story.

6 THE COURT: Excuse me one minute, counsel. Sorry.

7 Thank you.

8 MR. BAKER: Sure.

9 I'll finish by saying that I've been a lawyer for over
10 25 years. I spent 13 years at the commission, at the SEC. In
11 all those years, I have never seen a case filed in a district
12 where there was so little connection. It's blatant forum
13 shopping, and in their opposition papers, they admit twice --
14 and we don't have to guess why they filed it here, they admit
15 it twice -- they want to make the biggest media splash they can
16 make. They want to send a message, and they think only the
17 Southern District cases can send a message to the brokerage
18 community on Wall Street, and they're using blatant and brazen
19 forum shopping to be able to do that, and that is improper and
20 should not be allowed to stand. And I'll be interested in
21 knowing how they can justify hauling Utah defendants,
22 witnesses, documents into this court simply because they want
23 to send a message to Wall Street, simply because they want the
24 biggest media splash. That is brazen forum shopping, and that
25 is improper under any rule.

H9fWalpC

1 THE COURT: Thank you.

2 MR. BAKER: I think that about does it, your Honor.

3 THE COURT: Thank you.

4 Counsel, I'm going to take a recess in this civil case
5 and hear the criminal case, which is prepared. I'm very sorry
6 that I have to do this, but I need to interrupt you for this
7 criminal case.

8 (Recess)

9 THE COURT: Counsel in the SEC case, thank you very
10 much for letting me take that break.

11 Let me ask you, Mr. Carlyle, is there anything you
12 wish to say in response to the argument presented by Mr. Baker?

13 MR. CARLYLE: Your Honor, my cocounsel, Mr. Miller,
14 briefed this issue, and I believe he has some issues that he
15 would like to address.

16 MR. MILLER: Thank you, your Honor.

17 The first thing I want to address is the connection
18 between our allegations in the district that counsel spoke
19 about, or argued the lack of.

20 Just to back up, what Alpine does is, at least with
21 respect to this case -- it's a clearing firm -- it clears
22 trades on behalf of its clients, and it can't run its model
23 business without the type of platform that's provided by DTC
24 and NSCC. That platform is what allows clearing brokers like
25 Alpine to work at the high volumes that it does, and many of

H9fWalpC

1 those trades that are the subject of this complaint that flow
2 through Alpine and that Alpine directs to DTC are fraudulent.

3 There are a number of examples in there, and we allege
4 that many of Alpine's customers are violating securities laws
5 by having Alpine send securities transactions to the DTC
6 platform, and it's Alpine's failure to adequately report this
7 suspicious activity which is the entire basis of our complaint.

8 There was a comment that counsel made about the
9 difficulty or apparent difficulty to tell from the complaint
10 what we were alleging, and I think I'll point to paragraph 8 of
11 the complaint, where we allege that most of the transactions
12 that are the subject of the complaint did flow into DTC in this
13 district, and it's the failure to report those suspicious
14 transactions which are the basis for the alleged violations.

15 In short, I'll just finish that point by repeating
16 this comment in our briefs, that there is no requirement to
17 file a suspicious activity report without a suspicious
18 transaction. Those suspicious transactions in this case flow
19 predominantly into this district, and that's the reason why
20 venue is proper here under Section 27.

21 I think that shifts into the Section 1404 argument.
22 I'll start there with just commenting on the purpose for the
23 commission's choice of forum, which is I think the predominant
24 issue before you get into all the others. The purpose that we
25 explained in our brief was that Alpine has repeatedly failed to

H9fWalpC

1 report this suspicious activity that it directs to this
2 district. FINRA has told Alpine that its reports are
3 inadequate, and it's continued to do that. The point of filing
4 in this district is to prevent future misconduct by Alpine, and
5 in a way we're asking the Court's preventive injunctive relief
6 in this case.

7 Now, the secondary purpose that's related to prevent
8 further misconduct by Alpine in this district is the
9 precedential effect that a judgment in this district would have
10 on the industry, and this is definitely not to say that courts
11 in Utah are not as equally capable of applying federal law;
12 it's more of the reality of the fact that this is the nation's
13 financial center and that so many of the brokers and dealers
14 that do business here don't do business in Utah, and when there
15 are litigated disputes, a judgment from this Court just carries
16 more weight in most of those cases.

17 Finally, I think the only other factor that's really
18 disputed once you get to the reply is the convenience of
19 witnesses. Most of the other factors, I think, were based on
20 another misapprehension of Section 27 of the Exchange Act. We
21 can get into those factors if the Court wants, but there's no
22 problem compelling witnesses to attend trial in this district.
23 There's no problem with this Court requiring anybody in the
24 nation to respond to a document subpoena or a deposition
25 subpoena. And with respect to the convenience of the

H9fWalpC

1 witnesses, I think the Court doesn't have to go past the
2 motion, which is that Alpine wholly failed to follow just the
3 basic requirement of submitting a declaration that explains the
4 content of anticipated testimony in a way that allows the Court
5 to weigh the significance of the witnesses and to understand
6 who the primary witnesses are.

7 Now, there's a supplemental declaration that was
8 attached to the reply that I think the Court can disregard, but
9 even if we want to look at it, it doesn't cure any of the
10 defects. If you look through, again, it's a laundry list of 20
11 witnesses in a books-and-records case, many of whom have, I
12 think, copied and pasted the same description of testimony, so
13 at best it's cumulative. At worst, it's irrelevant, and
14 there's just no explanation of who Alpine thinks the primary
15 witnesses are, and there's no indication from the complaint or
16 the briefs why Alpine would need to call 20 employees to
17 testify about a books-and-records case.

18 I think the last point I want to address that counsel
19 brought up was the argument about the homeland security agents,
20 and it was actually the supplemental declaration, the last
21 paragraph, that made a point that Alpine witnesses, current
22 Alpine employees disagree with the SEC's summary of what they
23 anticipate their testimony to be. The declaration, if it does
24 anything, elevates the importance of these homeland security
25 agents to be there to testify about what the employees said the

H9fWalpC

1 first time they were interviewed.

2 Unless the Court has questions, I think that the
3 jurisdiction argument is clearly something that should be
4 summarily rejected. The fact that it was the thousands of
5 suspicious transactions that were sent to this district that
6 are the core basis the complaint gets us past 1406, and the
7 commission's choice of forum is not outweighed by any of the
8 other factors that are relevant under 1404.

9 THE COURT: Thank you.

10 I'm prepared to rule on the motion.

11 There were essentially three grounds raised. One was
12 the personal jurisdiction argument. That's been largely
13 abandoned. The original personal jurisdiction argument was
14 brought under New York long-arm statute, which is not the
15 controlling law with respect to that issue. There is a remnant
16 of that personal jurisdiction argument which has to do with the
17 due process clause, which is, of course, always relevant, but
18 the test there is as broad as everyone realizes.

19 Here, due process is not offended. The defendant's
20 entire business activity was directed to New York. It
21 purposefully avails itself every day it is in business of the
22 privilege of conducting activities in the Southern District of
23 New York, and this litigation is directly related to those
24 activities.

25 The essence of this dispute is whether SARs should

H9fWalpC

1 have been filed in connection with transactions cleared through
2 the Southern District of New York financial institutions, so
3 there's no problem under the due process clause with pursuing
4 this litigation by an exercise of personal jurisdiction, which
5 the federal securities laws allow throughout the geographic
6 boundaries of the United States.

7 The second argument is one connected with, as counsel
8 describe it, venue. It stems from Section 27, and that
9 provision of the law allows a suit or action to enforce
10 liability, under the relevant securities laws, to be brought in
11 any district wherein the defendant transacts business, and
12 there's no dispute that it is a core part of the defendant's
13 business -- that is, Alpine Securities Corporation -- to
14 transact business in the Southern District of New York.

15 I think that brings us, then, to the 1404 argument,
16 and as Mr. Baker acknowledged, that's the heart of the dispute
17 here. Counsel are familiar with opinions I've written in this
18 area. There are many, many opinions under 1404 that I and the
19 circuits and other district judges have issued, but I'll just
20 refer to my description of the law in the Poseidon case, 2016
21 WL 3017395, just for convenience. Each side has addressed that
22 and is familiar with that decision.

23 Of course, the first issue is whether or not the
24 plaintiff's choice of forum should be granted deference.
25 Normally it is granted deference, but under Second Circuit law,

H9fWalpC

1 the degree of deference can vary based on the circumstances in
2 the individual case. Here, it is appropriate to grant the
3 SEC's choice of forum -- that is, the Southern District of New
4 York -- deference. It is not chosen for an improper purpose.
5 As everyone acknowledges, New York is the financial center of
6 this country, and securities litigation is regularly conducted
7 in this district. It is not improper to seek to pursue this
8 litigation that is so central to the defendant's business in
9 the Southern District of New York.

10 Let's turn, then, to the private and public interests
11 that must be weighed under Section 1404.

12 Again, the defendant bears the burden here of showing
13 that these factors tilt in its favor. The private factors
14 include the relative ease of access to sources of proof; the
15 availability of compulsory process for the attendance of any
16 unwilling witness; the cost of obtaining attendance of willing
17 witness; the possibility of viewing a premises not at issue
18 here, and all other practical problems that may be associated
19 with making a trial easy, expeditious and inexpensive.

20 Then one would turn to the public factors, including
21 congestion in the court; the interests of forums in having
22 localized controversies decided at home; the interest in not
23 imposing jury duty on people with no interest in the litigation
24 and any unfamiliarity with the law that applies that would be
25 greater in one district versus the other.

H9fWalpC

1 The defendant has not shown that these factors tilt in
2 its favor and certainly not sufficiently to overcome the
3 deference to be shown the plaintiff's choice of forum.

4 This is primarily a document case, and therefore the
5 records are equally available to both parties in whatever
6 district this case would be prosecuted or pursued. There's no
7 dispute that process would require the attendance of witnesses
8 in the Southern District of New York in this action, and there
9 will be some burden with respect to witnesses having to travel
10 to this district from Utah and other locations, including Maine
11 and Iowa, but not a sufficient showing of how many such
12 witnesses there are that are realistically needed for a trial
13 or hearing in this district. It was the defendant's burden to
14 make that showing, and it has failed to do so.

15 In terms of public interest factors, there is no
16 problem with court congestion here. I'm able to speedily
17 address this case on my docket. Certainly there's no burden on
18 a New York jury of addressing issues related to the enforcement
19 of the securities laws, which are at the heart of much of the
20 financial lifeblood of this district and its businesses and
21 people, and certainly no inability for this Court to understand
22 the relevant law, though that doesn't give me any advantage
23 over the District of Utah. We're all federal judges. We can
24 all apply and understand federal law. I don't have an
25 advantage here, but I don't have a disadvantage there either.

H9fWalpC

1 Therefore, the application to transfer is denied.

2 Let's turn to the initial conference issues. I have
3 the Rule 26(f) report. It indicates that the parties are going
4 to make their initial disclosures in this case in a week,
5 September 22. That's just fine.

6 The SEC has provided the defendant with a protective
7 order, and I know the defendant has been reviewing that, so why
8 don't I also expect a protective order to be submitted to me
9 for signature next Friday, the 22nd. If there's any
10 disagreement about a particular provision, just give one order
11 with the disputed language in bold so I can read that disputed
12 language in context, but I expect to be able to review that and
13 approve it, or not, next Friday.

14 Then let's talk about schedule generally for fact
15 discovery. I'm going to assume that in early October, initial
16 interrogatories and document demands will be served and they'll
17 be responded to in early November.

18 How many depositions does the SEC wish to take?

19 MR. CARLYLE: Your Honor, we had originally discussed
20 a limit of 10 deposition, but that was before we saw, in this
21 briefing here, that the defendants intend to rely on up to, I
22 think, 20 witnesses that they've listed. As you noted, we have
23 yet to exchange 26(a)(1) disclosures, but if indeed it looks
24 like the defendant intends to rely on the 20 witnesses, we may
25 well seek to take that many depositions.

H9fWalpC

1 THE COURT: OK. Let's approach this anew. You've
2 described this to me as a books-and-records case, so you're
3 going to need a 30(b)(6). Who do you need besides the
4 30(b)(6)? Was there a compliance officer?

5 MR. CARLYLE: Your Honor, yes. I must say I think my
6 cocounsel is more familiar with the folks who are on that list
7 right now.

8 THE COURT: Don't look at the defendant's list. That
9 was a list prepared for this motion. I'm talking about who you
10 think you want.

11 MR. CARLYLE: Yes, your Honor. We have a list. It's,
12 I believe, five witnesses. I think it's two different chief
13 compliance officers.

14 THE COURT: So a 30(b)(6), two compliance officers,
15 and who else?

16 MR. CARLYLE: A general counsel.

17 THE COURT: And is that someone, if there's an
18 advice-of-counsel defense, or general counsel you think is
19 going to be able to give deposition testimony?

20 MR. CARLYLE: It's someone that we anticipate being
21 able to give deposition testimony as a fact witness based on
22 involvement in the process of providing and submitting the SARs
23 reports.

24 THE COURT: OK.

25 MR. CARLYLE: OK?

H9fWalpC

1 THE COURT: That's four.

2 MR. CARLYLE: Yes.

3 THE COURT: Anyone else?

4 MR. CARLYLE: I apologize. It's the chief compliance
5 officer, the general counsel, an AML officer. I'm sorry.

6 There are three people that are described as AML officers, who
7 are within the compliance function but are not actually the
8 chief compliance officer.

9 THE COURT: When you say AML, what does that mean?

10 MR. CARLYLE: I apologize. It's antimoney laundering,
11 and it's the function under which the SAR filings fall.

12 THE COURT: OK. Let's assume you only need one of
13 those.

14 MR. CARLYLE: OK.

15 THE COURT: I mean, this is a business practice case,
16 right?

17 MR. CARLYLE: Understood, your Honor, but those folks
18 worked at Alpine during different points in time during the
19 relevant period, so they do have different --

20 THE COURT: Oh.

21 MR. CARLYLE: It's not three people who had
22 overlapping responsibilities.

23 THE COURT: OK. To cover each of the periods at
24 issue, you need three people.

25 MR. CARLYLE: Yes, your Honor.

H9fWalpC

1 THE COURT: OK. Anyone else?

2 MR. CARLYLE: That's our list right now, save for the
3 homeland security agents that have been referenced before that
4 may or may not be needed.

5 THE COURT: You're not planning to take their
6 depositions.

7 MR. CARLYLE: No. That's correct, your Honor. Sorry.

8 THE COURT: OK. That's six depositions. Great.

9 Mr. Baker, how many do you need?

10 MR. LABENTA: Your Honor, Aaron Lebenta, if I might
11 address this.

12 The problem we're having right now is we don't
13 actually know which SARs are at issue. They haven't identified
14 them in the complaint. The reason we identified so many
15 individuals within our declaration and supplemental declaration
16 is we just identified those folks responsible for the BSA
17 compliance program during the relevant time period.

18 We will need at least to take the depositions of at
19 least the former employees of Alpine, which I think there's six
20 as well, but there may be more. We're going to have to have
21 expert depositions.

22 THE COURT: I'm just dealing with fact witnesses.

23 MR. LABENTA: Just fact witnesses.

24 THE COURT: Fact witness.

25 MR. LABENTA: At this point in time, without knowing

H9fWalpC

1 which SARs are at issue, your Honor, we would like ten.

2 THE COURT: OK.

3 MR. LABENTA: Because I don't know which witnesses we
4 need.

5 THE COURT: Let's step back here. It's a program that
6 you ran.

7 MR. LABENTA: Yes.

8 THE COURT: You had procedures, you had policies.

9 MR. LABENTA: Yes.

10 THE COURT: You've heard who the SEC wants.

11 MR. LABENTA: Yes.

12 THE COURT: There will be a 30(b)(6).

13 MR. LABENTA: Right.

14 THE COURT: Two compliance officers, because they had
15 different periods of time in which they were in charge; general
16 counsel; and three AML personnel, again because there are three
17 different periods.

18 MR. LABENTA: Right.

19 THE COURT: OK. Who do you want besides that?

20 MR. LABENTA: We're going to want one more. Any
21 former employee, including Ms. Farmer.

22 THE COURT: I don't know what her position is.

23 MR. LABENTA: She was an AML officer, but she appears
24 to be the key witness that they're relying upon. She's the
25 individual who is now in Iowa.

H9fWalpC

1 THE COURT: So not one of the three?

2 MR. LABENTA: I don't know.

3 Go ahead.

4 MR. CARLYLE: To clarify, she was one of the witnesses
5 that I described as the chief compliance officer. I understand
6 that wasn't her title for a period of time.

7 MR. LABENTA: OK.

8 THE COURT: She's already being deposed.

9 MR. LABENTA: That's fine. I guess if I had names --
10 it's tough, because I don't know who's qualified.

11 THE COURT: You have the titles.

12 MR. LABENTA: There's a number of them, your Honor.
13 That's the only issue.

14 THE COURT: OK, counsel. Let's deal with it this way.
15 This is for planning purposes. I'm not sure the defendant is
16 going to want to take any depositions, but it may. I'm not
17 going to let you take more than six.

18 MR. LABENTA: OK.

19 THE COURT: Without coming to me and making a specific
20 showing as to why you need more than six.

21 MR. LABENTA: OK.

22 THE COURT: All in all, we're making a plan here that
23 there will be twelve depositions in this case, fact
24 depositions. I'm not sure that we're going to have any more
25 than six. It may not be in the defendant's interest to take

H9fWalpC

1 any depositions; I have no idea.

2 MR. LABENTA: Yes.

3 THE COURT: We're now in a position to make a plan.

4 The initial interrogatories and document demands are
5 served, roughly, under our plan early in October and responded
6 to in early November. You then spend the rest of November
7 looking at the documents that have been produced.

8 You can start depositions in December. You have
9 twelve depositions in all, so fact discovery will end March 30.
10 You folks want expert discovery, so April 20 will be the expert
11 report by the party bearing the burden. May 11 will be
12 rebuttal expert reports, and June 1, expert discovery will
13 close.

14 I saw here that there was a desire for summary
15 judgment practice. If there is going to be a summary judgment
16 motion, it will be filed June 13. Opposition will be August 3.
17 Reply will be August 17.

18 Is there a demand for a jury, or is this a nonjury
19 case?

20 MR. CARLYLE: There is, your Honor.

21 THE COURT: There is what?

22 MR. CARLYLE: I'm sorry. There is a demand for a
23 jury.

24 THE COURT: OK. If there is no summary judgment
25 motion, then the pretrial order in this jury case will be due

H9fWalpC

1 July 13.

2 OK. Now, let's talk about settlement. We have a
3 mediation program in this district. We also have an
4 opportunity to send you to a magistrate judge for settlement
5 discussions. Your magistrate judge is Judge Ellis.

6 Let's talk about a schedule for settlement
7 discussions. I'm going to suggest that you pursue settlement
8 discussions probably in February. That would give you a chance
9 to have taken a couple of depositions, to have a really good
10 handle on the case and yet save you some of the expense of
11 expert discovery. Does February for settlement discussions
12 sound about right?

13 MR. CARLYLE: For the SEC, yes, your Honor.

14 THE COURT: Mr. Labenta.

15 MR. LABENTA: No problem. Yes, that would be fine.

16 THE COURT: February for settlement discussions. And
17 do you want to go before a mediator or Magistrate Judge Ellis?

18 MR. CARLYLE: The SEC would be happy with either,
19 prefer the magistrate judge.

20 THE COURT: Mr. Baker, Mr. Labenta.

21 MR. LABENTA: That would be fine with us as well, the
22 magistrate judge, but either would be fine.

23 THE COURT: If either would be fine, I'm going to send
24 you to a mediator. I'll get out a scheduling order with these
25 critical dates, but fact discovery will conclude March 30;

H9fWalpC

1 expert discovery June 1; any summary judgment motion, or in its
2 absence, a pretrial order in this jury case will be due July 13
3 next year.

4 Let's talk about discovery.

5 Yes, counsel.

6 MR. LABENTA: Your Honor, just from the defendant's
7 position, they've alleged over 5,000 individual SARs
8 violations. They've been investigating this case for literally
9 years. We don't even know at this stage what violations
10 they're talking about, which SARs they actually claim are in
11 violation. Respectfully, your Honor, March 30 seems kind of
12 tight for us to conduct this analysis of thousands when they
13 have had literally years to do their front end. We're in a
14 defensive position. We don't know from their complaint which
15 ones they claim or why they claim they're inadequate.

16 In order to get depositions done in December, I'm not
17 quite sure how we're going to get the very base, foundational
18 knowledge we need to have in order to conduct those depositions
19 in such a tight schedule. I do appreciate the Court moving it
20 forward, but I'm concerned about the schedule.

21 THE COURT: This is part of the Rule 26(f) conference
22 among the parties. Have you discussed with each other how
23 you're going to get those transactions identified?

24 Not yet? Why don't we take a break. Why don't we
25 take a break. You're here. It makes sense for everybody to

H9fWalpC

1 try to get on the same page and have those discussions,
2 complete your 26(f) conference. Try to make as much progress
3 as you can, and my law clerk will let you know how to get in
4 touch with my chambers, and I'll resume this conference when
5 you're ready to discuss these issues in more detail with me.

6 Let me just complete this portion of the conference by
7 telling you how we're going to conduct discovery. If you have
8 a discovery problem, you have to meet and confer, try to
9 resolve it in good faith. If you have any problem after that
10 meet-and-confer process that remains unresolved, write me a
11 letter no longer than two pages. I'll get you on the phone,
12 hear you out, and give you a ruling.

13 If you want discovery, you have to be diligent and
14 pursue it. Move forward, if March comes and you haven't taken
15 any deposition, it's too late.

16 Good. My law clerk will tell you how to get in touch
17 with me. You can use my jury room for your consultations.
18 Good luck.

19 (Recess)

20 THE COURT: You may be seated.

21 Mr. Baker, have you had an opportunity to confer with
22 the SEC?

23 MR. BAKER: Yes, we have, your Honor, and I think I'll
24 have Mr. Labenta speak to that.

25 MR. LABENTA: Your Honor, it's my understanding -- you

H9fWalpC

1 guys will correct me if I've overstated something -- that they
2 will provide us with the documents as soon as we have the
3 protective order entered, and they're going to provide a
4 schedule. Just having the documents isn't all that helpful.
5 We need to know what they claim is wrong with them. They said
6 they could have a schedule prepared of what they claim is wrong
7 with each SAR by the end of October, which means we can't
8 really start what we're doing until the end of October, which,
9 given that, I would like if we could to push everything out
10 maybe 30 days, just given that we're not going to be able to
11 start. It is what it is, that it can't be provided until then.

12 THE COURT: Mr. Carlyle.

13 MR. CARLYLE: Your Honor, Mr. Miller will address this
14 line.

15 MR. MILLER: That's the gist of the agreement we just
16 got to, and the SEC's going to put together that schedule
17 regardless of the timeline, so we'll get it to the other side
18 as soon as we can, but we have no strong objection to an extra
19 30 days, and we also have no problem with the current schedule
20 the Court laid out, so we'd defer to the Court.

21 THE COURT: Mr. Miller, you don't have such a
22 schedule?

23 MR. MILLER: What we have is a, I'll call it a big
24 step towards a schedule, and so there are some mechanical
25 things that have to happen in sequence, and one of them is as

H9fWalpC

1 simple as making sure that the schedule is citing to the
2 correct pages and those pages get labeled once they're
3 produced. It's more of a big, I guess I'll just call it a
4 housekeeping project.

5 Like I said, if it gets done mid-October or earlier
6 than that, we'll send it over the day it's ready. I'd say
7 we've been working on it, and definitely we're not starting
8 from scratch, but it's not complete in a product that we could
9 call a response to a discovery request yet.

10 THE COURT: How about two weeks?

11 MR. MILLER: Two weeks from?

12 THE COURT: Today.

13 MR. MILLER: I think that we'll definitely give it a
14 shot, and perhaps if we get close to two weeks and it looks
15 like there's something unforeseen that came up, we can address
16 it with defendant first. And if then if there's still a
17 problem, we can address the Court, but we'll definitely make a
18 shot for two weeks. And assuming the protective order is in by
19 then, I think we'll be OK on that end.

20 THE COURT: Good. Terrific. I didn't put down an
21 actual date for the protective order on my notes. I think we
22 were just talking about it informally.

23 Who is producing the draft?

24 MR. MILLER: We're working together. The SEC will
25 take the lead in actually submitting it. It should be a joint

H9fWalpC

1 proposal, and I think the Court did mention that we should be
2 filing it by no later than the 22nd, when we do our initial
3 disclosures. Again, if it's something we get to on Monday or
4 Tuesday, the commission will submit it as soon as it's ready,
5 but no later than next week.

6 THE COURT: OK, but in any event, we talked about a
7 schedule which would have it signed far in advance, at least a
8 week in advance, of your production of the chart.

9 MR. LABENTA: Yes.

10 THE COURT: Good.

11 Good luck, counsel. Thank you.

12 (Adjourned)